

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

RICARDO RODRIGUEZ-TIRADO, et al.

Plaintiffs,

v.

SPEEDY BAIL BONDS, et al.

Defendants

CIVIL NO. 13-1671 (PAD)

ORDER

On August 31, 2013, plaintiffs initiated this action against various defendants alleging negligence under Puerto Rico law (Docket No. 1). On February 24, 2014, Chief Judge Aida M. Delgado-Colón issued a Case Management Order setting August 31, 2014 as the discovery cutoff date, and granting the parties until September 15, 2014 to move for summary judgment (Docket No. 22). On June 3, 2014, the case was transferred to the undersigned's docket (Docket No. 25). On January 12, 2015, the discovery period was extended to April 30, 2015, and the motion for summary judgment deadline extended to May 29, 2015 (Docket No. 35). On April 30, 2015, the parties filed a joint motion for extension of time until August 1, 2015 to conclude discovery (Docket No. 36), which was granted the following day (Docket No. 37). On July 31, 2015, the parties filed another joint motion for extension of time, until October 1, 2015, to conclude discovery (Docket No. 38). That request was granted, and in doing so, the court forewarned the parties that the case was over two years old such that no further requests for extensions would be entertained (Docket No. 39).

On September 21, 2015, defendants moved to dismiss under Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(b) for plaintiffs' alleged failure to prosecute this action (Docket No. 40). The motion was referred to Magistrate Judge Bruce J. McGiverin (Docket No. 43), who, on February 17, 2016 issued a Report

Rodriguez-Tirado et al v. Speedy Bail Bonds et al

Civil No. 13-1671 (PAD)

Order

Page 2

and Recommendation, recommending that it be denied (Docket No. 49). The parties were granted until March 7, 2016 to file objections. To date, no objection has been filed.

After conducting a *de novo* review of the motion at Docket No. 40, the opposition (Docket No. 42), the “supplemental opposition” (Docket No. 45) as well as the Report and Recommendation, the court determines that the magistrate judge’s findings are well supported in the record and the law. With that in mind, the court **ADOPTS** in its entirety the magistrate judge’s report for the reasons stated therein (Docket No. 49), and, accordingly, **DENIES** defendants’ motion to dismiss (Docket No. 40).

In light of this Order, the parties shall submit, not later than March 16, 2016, a JOINT MOTION indicating (1) the anticipated length of trial; and (2) whether they consent to having this case tried before a U.S. Magistrate Judge.

SO ORDERED.

In San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 8th day of March, 2016.

S/Pedro A. Delgado-Hernández

PEDRO A. DELGADO-HERNÁNDEZ

United States District Judge